

May, 1993

On Solvable Lattice Models and Knot Invariants

DORON GEPNER

*Division of Physics, Mathematics and Astronomy**Mail Code 452-48**California Institute of Technology**Pasadena, CA 91125*

ABSTRACT

Recently, a class of solvable interaction round the face lattice models (IRF) were constructed for an arbitrary rational conformal field theory (RCFT) and an arbitrary field in it. The Boltzmann weights of the lattice models are related in the extreme ultra violet limit to the braiding matrices of the rational conformal field theory. In this note we use these new lattice models to construct a link invariant for any such pair of an RCFT and a field in it. Using the properties of RCFT and the IRF lattice models, we prove that the invariants so constructed always obey the Markov properties, and thus are true link invariants. Further, all the known link invariants, such as the Jones, HOMFLY and Kauffman polynomials arise in this way, along with giving a host of new invariants, and thus also a unified approach to link polynomials. It is speculated that all link invariants arise from some RCFT, and thus the problem of classifying link and knot invariants is equivalent to that of classifying two dimensional conformal field theory.

★ On leave from the Weizmann Institute, Israel. Incumbent of the Sorrela and Henry Shapiro Chair.

The intriguing interplay between knot theory and two dimensional physics has benefited considerably both fields (for a review, see, e.g., [1]). The purpose of this note is to put forwards a general framework for link invariants stemming from solvable lattice models. It was recently shown that solvable fusion interaction round the face (IRF) lattice models are in a one-to-one correspondence with a pair of a rational conformal field theory and a field in it [2]. It follows as we shall see that for each such pair one can form a link invariant, and that this class of link invariants is in a one to one correspondence with such pairs.

Let us review the construction of the Boltzmann weights described in ref. [2]. Consider a rational conformal field theory (RCFT) $\mathcal{O}$, and a field in it, x , which for simplicity we shall assume to be a primary field. We than construct a solvable IRF model, denoted by $\text{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, x)$ following [2], whose admissibility conditions are given by fusion with respect for x and whose Boltzmann weights reduce in the extreme ultra violet limit to a specialization of the braiding matrix of the RCFT (see [2] for more detail). We put on the vertices of the lattice, which is a square two dimensional one, state variables which are the primary fields of $\mathcal{O}$ and are labeled by $a, b, c, \dots$. The pair a and b is allowed to be on the same link, $a \sim b$, if and only if, the fusion coefficient $N_{ax}^b > 0$. The partition function of the model is

$$Z = \sum_{\text{configurations}} \prod_{\text{faces}} w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & u \\ c & d & \end{array} \right), \quad (1)$$

where a, b, c and d are the four states (primary fields) on the vertices of the face, $w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & u \\ c & d & \end{array} \right)$ is the Boltzmann weight associated to the face, and u is a spectral parameter which labels a family of models. The Boltzmann weights obey the star triangle equation (STE), from which it follows that the transfer matrices for different values of the spectral parameter u commute, and thus the model is solvable.

The Boltzmann weights of the model $\text{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, x)$ were given in ref. [2], and are conveniently described in an operator form. To do so define the operator $X_s(u)$,

the face transfer matrix, by

$$X_s(u)_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n} = \prod_{i \neq s} \delta(l_i, m_i) w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} l_{i-1} & m_i & \\ l_i & l_{i+1} & u \end{array} \right), \quad (2)$$

where l_i and m_i are the states on two adjacent diagonals of the lattice. The face transfer matrix of the model $\text{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, x)$ is [2]

$$X_s(u) = \sum_{a=1}^N P_s^a f^a(u), \quad (3)$$

where $a = 1, 2, \dots, N$ labels the fields appearing in the operator product $x \cdot x$, P^a is a projection operator of the braiding matrix on the a field in the operator product defined by

$$P^a = \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq a}}^N \frac{B_s - \lambda_j}{\lambda_a - \lambda_j}, \quad (4)$$

and where B_s is the braiding matrix of the RCFT at the face s , and λ_j are its eigenvalues, which are given by

$$\lambda_j = e^{i\pi(2\Delta_x - \Delta_j)}, \quad (5)$$

and Δ_x and Δ_j are the conformal dimensions of the field x and the j field in the operator product $x \cdot x$, respectively.

The functions $f^a(u)$ are defined by,

$$f^a(u) = \prod_{j=1}^{a-1} \sin(\zeta_j + u) \prod_{j=a}^{N-1} \sin(\zeta_j - u), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\zeta_i = \pi(\Delta_{i+1} - \Delta_i)/2, \quad (7)$$

and $\lambda = \zeta_1$ is the crossing parameter of the model. The projection operators obey,

$$\begin{aligned} P_s^a P_s^b &= \delta_{ab} P_s^a, \\ 1 &= \sum_{a=1}^N P_a, \\ B_s &= \sum_{a=1}^N P_s^a \lambda_a, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

from which it follows that the face transfer matrix obeys the unitarity condition,

$$X_s(u) X_s(-u) = \rho(u) \rho(-u), \tag{9}$$

where the unitarity factor is

$$\rho(u) = f^N(u) = \prod_{i=1}^{N-1} \sin(\zeta_i + u). \tag{10}$$

Also, this implies the regularity condition,

$$X_s(0) = \rho(0) \cdot 1. \tag{11}$$

An important, and highly non trivial, property of the Boltzmann weights is the crossing symmetry,

$$w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & \lambda - u \\ c & d & \end{array} \right) = \left(\frac{\psi_b \psi_c}{\psi_a \psi_d} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} c & a & u \\ d & b & \end{array} \right), \tag{12}$$

where the crossing multiplier ψ_a is given in terms of the torus modular function S_{ab} ,

$$\psi_a = \frac{S_{a,0}}{S_{0,0}}, \tag{13}$$

where ‘0’ denotes the unit field. Repeating the crossing transformation twice im-

plies the charge conjugation symmetry:

$$w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & u \\ c & d & \end{array} \right) = w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} d & c & u \\ b & a & \end{array} \right). \quad (14)$$

It is convenient to define the two braiding operators,

$$G_i^\pm = \lim_{u \rightarrow \pm\infty} X_i(u)/\rho(u), \quad (15)$$

where G_i^+ (denoted also for simplicity by G_i) differs from the conformal braiding matrix B_i by an irrelevant phase. In terms of the Boltzmann weights, this is

$$\sigma \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & \pm \\ d & c & \end{array} \right) = \lim_{u \rightarrow \pm\infty} w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} a & b & u \\ c & d & \end{array} \right) / \rho(u), \quad (16)$$

from which it follows that $G_i^+ = (G_i^-)^\dagger$, i.e., they are complex conjugates of each other, and that $G_i^\pm$ obey the Braid group relationships which are

$$\begin{aligned} G_i G_{i+1} G_i &= G_{i+1} G_i G_{i+1}, \\ G_i G_j &= G_j G_i \quad \text{for } |i - j| > 1, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

which is the relation obeyed by the generators of the braiding group, i.e., G_i can be considered as the generator of the braiding of the i and $i + 1$ strands in a braid. By Artin theorem these are the generating relations for the braid group.

A link is formed by connecting the end points of a braid. Labeling the end points $l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n$ and $m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n$, as before, we connect with a strand the l_i and m_i end points, for all i . This procedure is ambiguous as different braids may give the same (topologically) link. We call such braids equivalent. It was shown by Markov [3], that two braids are equivalent if and only if they can be related by the sequence of moves of the two types,

$$(I) \quad AB \rightarrow BA \quad \text{for } A, B \in B_n, \quad (18)$$

$$(II) \quad A \rightarrow AG_n^{\pm 1} \quad \text{for } A \in B_n, \quad (19)$$

where B_n denotes the braid group on n elements, defined by the relations eq. (17).

In order to classify links we wish to form a functional α which assigns a complex number for each link, in such a way that topologically equivalent links will have the same value of α , $\alpha(A) = \alpha(B)$ if A and B are equivalent topologically. To do so, it is thus sufficient to demand that α is invariant under the Markov moves. We define a Markov trace on a braid, $\phi(A)$, for $A \in B_n$, to be a complex number obeying the properties,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(I)} \quad & \phi(AB) = \phi(BA), \quad A, B \in B_n, \\ \text{(II)} \quad & \phi(AG_n) = \tau\phi(A), \quad \phi(AG_n^{-1}) = \bar{\tau}\phi(A), \quad A \in B_n, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

and where the parameters τ and $\bar{\tau}$ are

$$\tau = \phi(G_i), \quad \bar{\tau} = \phi(G_i^{-1}). \tag{21}$$

The link invariant $\alpha(A)$ is formed in terms of the Markov trace $\phi(A)$, by

$$\alpha(A) = (\tau\bar{\tau})^{-(n-1)/2} (\tau/\bar{\tau})^{e(A)/2} \phi(A), \tag{22}$$

where $e(A)$ is the exponent sum of the braid, i.e.,

$$e\left(\prod_{i=1}^n G_i^{a_i}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i, \tag{23}$$

which is evidently a well defined grading, since it is preserved by the braid group relationships, eqs. (17).

We next proceed to describe a Markov trace based on the lattice model $\text{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, x)$. ■
Note that any element of the braid group, $A \in B_n$ is represented by some diagonal to diagonal transfer matrix, $A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n}$, where the generators are represented by the conformal braiding matrix G_i . Now, define the diagonal matrix,

$$(H^n)_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n} = \prod_{i=1}^n \delta(l_i, m_i) \frac{S_{l_n, 0}}{S_{l_1, 0}}, \tag{24}$$

where S is, as before, the torus modular matrix, which gives the crossing multiplier.

Define also a constrained trace by,

$$\hat{\text{Tr}}(A) = \sum_{l_2, l_3, \dots, l_n} A_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}. \quad (25)$$

Then the Markov trace is defined by

$$\phi(A) = \frac{\hat{\text{Tr}}(H^n A)}{\hat{\text{Tr}}(H^n)}, \quad (26)$$

for any element of the braid group A . It remains to show that the Markov trace so defined, $\phi(A)$ obeys the properties (I) and (II), eqs. (18–19). Property (I) follows trivially from the definition, while property (II) follows from a straight forwards calculation, provided that the Boltzmann weights obey the Markov property,

$$\sum_{b \sim a} w \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} b & a & u \\ a & c & \end{array} \right) \frac{S_{b,0}}{S_{a,0}} = H(u) \rho(u), \quad (27)$$

where $H(u)$ is some function independent of a and c . The parameters τ and $\bar{\tau}$ are given by

$$\tau, \bar{\tau} = \lim_{u \rightarrow \pm\infty} H(u)/H(0), \quad (28)$$

where τ ($\bar{\tau}$) corresponds to the plus (minus) sign in the limit.

Using the crossing property, eq. (12), it is straight forwards to show that the extended Markov property holds provided that the following relation is valid,

$$X_i(\lambda) X_i(u) = \beta(u) X_i(\lambda), \quad (29)$$

where $\beta(\lambda - u) = H(u) \rho(u)$. We shall now show that for the models $\text{IRF}(\mathcal{O}, x)$ the property eq. (29) holds and that thus ϕ is always a good Markov trace. This is

a simple calculation using eqs. (8). We note that $X_i(\lambda) = P_i^N f^N(\lambda)$, since $f^a(\lambda)$ vanishes for $a \neq N$. Thus $X_i(\lambda)$ is indeed a projection operator and so

$$X_i(\lambda)X_i(u) = f^N(\lambda) \sum_{a=1}^N P_i^N P_i^a f^a(u) = \beta(u)X_i(\lambda), \quad (30)$$

where we used eqs. (3,8), and

$$\beta(u) = f^N(u) = \prod_{a=1}^N \sin(\zeta_i + u). \quad (31)$$

It follows that the parameters are

$$H(u) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{\sin(\lambda + \zeta_i - u)}{\sin(\zeta_i + u)}, \quad (32)$$

and

$$\tau = e^{iN\lambda} \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{\sin(\zeta_i)}{\sin(\lambda + \zeta_i)}, \quad (33)$$

and $\bar{\tau} = \tau^\dagger$. It follows that the invariant we defined, eq. (22), indeed assumes the same values for topologically equivalent links, and thus can be used to classify knots and links.

For a number of examples of IRF models, the link invariants we defined here were previously calculated (for a review, see [1], and references therein). For example, the unrestricted Lie algebra model A_{m-1} give rise to the HOMFLY polynomial [4] (as a polynomial in m and the crossing parameter), which is a two variable generalization of the original Alexander polynomial [5] (at the limit $m \rightarrow 0$) and the more recent Jones polynomial [6] ($m = 2$ case). The unrestricted B_m , C_m and D_m IRF models give the Kauffman polynomial [7]. These models correspond to the current algebra RCFT based on the Lie algebras A , B , C , D , with the field which is the fundamental representation for A_n , and the vector representation for the other algebras.

It is noteworthy that the construction presented here, while encompassing all the known link invariants, provides for a very far reaching generalization of these, along with a unified framework for their construction. Such new invariants are indeed needed in the problem of classifying links as it is well known that two topological distinct links may certainly have identical classifying polynomials (see for example Birman's example [8] of two different knots that have the same Jones polynomial).

The link invariants we defined eq. (22) may be calculated directly for each IRF model by substituting the Boltzmann weights and performing the traces. This is however rather cumbersome for big links. A considerable simplification is provided by the skein relations which relate the invariants of different links [5, 9]. To derive skein relations for the invariants described here, first note that the Braiding matrix G_i obeys a fixed N th order polynomial equation,

$$\sum_{m=0}^N a_m G_i^m = \prod_{m=1}^N (G_i^m - \lambda_m) = 0, \quad (34)$$

where we used eq. (5). Define the link L_m to be the link obtained with the insertion of the braid element G_i^m , i.e., if L described by the braid A , then L_m is described by the braid AG_i^m . Using the polynomial relation, eq. (34), we find immediately the relation for the Markov trace,

$$\sum_{m=-k}^{N-k} a_m \phi(L_m) = 0, \quad (35)$$

for any k . Substituting this into the definition of the invariant, eq. (22), we find the skein relation,

$$\sum_{-k}^{N-k} b_m \alpha(L_m) = 0, \quad (36)$$

where

$$b_m = a_m (\tau/\bar{\tau})^{-m/2}. \quad (37)$$

The skein relation, eq. (36), is a very effective tool for the calculation of link

invariants.

We thus describe in this note a whole wealth of link invariants which are in a one to one correspondence with a pair of a rational conformal field theory and a field in this theory. The RCFT and the field chosen are arbitrary, and every RCFT gives rise to different invariants. It is tantalizing to speculate on this in a number of directions. First, since all known link polynomials arise in this fashion, one might conjecture that the category of link invariants and the category of pairs of conformal field theory and a field in it are in fact equivalent ones, and that the problem of classifying link invariants is thus the same as that of classifying conformal field theory. Second, one might ponder the generalization of these ideas to all conformal field theories, not necessarily rational. There does not seem to be any obstacle in doing so, and the entire construction might be carried, *mutatis mutandis*. This will also open up an entire different type of invariants, so called irrational, which, in particular, obey an infinite order skein relations, i.e., a Laurent series type rather than polynomial. Such invariants appear not to have been studied before.

Finally, it is hoped that the results described here will be of help in the further understanding of both knot theory and two dimensional physics, along with the fascinating interrelationship between them.

REFERENCES

1. M. Wadati, T. Deguchi and Y. Akutsu, Phys. Rep. 180 (1989) 247
2. D. Gepner, Foundations of rational conformal field theory, I, Caltech preprint, CALT 68–1825, November (1992)
3. A.A. Markov, Recueil Math. Moscou 1 (1935) 73
4. P. Freyd, D. Yetter, J. Hoste, W.B.R. Lickorish, K. Millet and A. Ocneanu, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. 12 (1985) 239
5. J.W. Alexander, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 30 (1928) 275
6. V.F.R. Jones, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. 12 (1985) 103
7. L.H. Kauffman, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., to be published.
8. J.S. Birman, Invent. Math. 81 (1985) 287
9. J.H. Conway, in Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra, ed. J. Leech (Pargamon, New–York, 1970) p. 329